

Reply to “Bouncing Universes and their perturbations: remarks on a toy model”.

Jérôme Martin* and Patrick Peter†

Institut d’Astrophysique de Paris, G℞CO, FRE 2435-CNRS, 98bis boulevard Arago, 75014 Paris, France

(Dated: June 14th, 2004)

In this web note, we reply to a recent paper [1] confirming a previous work of ours in which a cosmological bouncing phase was shown to have the ability of modifying the spectrum of primordial perturbations [2], but challenging its physical conditions of validity. Explicitly, Ref. [1], besides pretending our Taylor series expansion of the scale factor close to the bounce amounts to choosing a family of polynomial scale factors, also claims that the bounce affects the spectrum only if the mass scale of the scalar field driving the dynamics is of the order of the Planck mass. We show that these objections are either misleading or incorrect since the minimum size of the Universe a_0 (value of the scale factor at the bounce) is either not physically specified, as required in a closed Universe, or implicitly assumed to be the Planck mass. We calculate this mass and obtain that, unsurprisingly, for a reasonable value of a_0 , *i.e.* much larger than the Planck length, the scalar field mass is smaller than the Planck mass.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq, 98.70.Vc

In Ref. [1], some comments and remarks were made concerning our work of Ref. [2]. The main result of Ref. [1] is an independent confirmation of the fact that a bounce can affect cosmological perturbations not only by an overall amplitude but also by changing the spectrum, a result first obtained in Ref. [2]. However, Ref. [1] also criticizes the conditions of validity under which the results of Ref. [2] hold true, arguing that the physical situations leading to such a spectral change are highly specific and potentially problematic; the arguments produced are, we believe, either misleading or erroneous, and in this short note we want to correct them.

The purpose of our work [2] was to discuss the propagation of cosmological perturbations through a regular bounce, thus concentrating explicitly in the immediate vicinity of the bounce only. Since it is always possible to Taylor expand a regular function on a finite interval, the choice of taking the scale factor as a series in conformal time η (a similar relation holding as a function of cosmic time t)

$$\frac{a(\eta)}{a_0} \simeq 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \right)^2 + \delta \left(\frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \right)^3 + \frac{5}{24} (1 + \xi) \left(\frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \right)^4 + \dots \quad (1)$$

is the most general case that can be handled provided $\eta \ll \eta_0$. This expansion was thus used in Ref. [2] in order to derive conclusions about the propagation of cosmological perturbations through a bounce without specifying the model at all times, in particular far from the bounce.

Apparently, Ref. [1] confused this Taylor series, valid only close to the bounce, *i.e.* for $\eta \ll \eta_0$, with an actual “family of polynomial scale factors”, see Eq. (2.3) of Ref. [1]. This is made even clearer through the sentences: “in order to relate the pre-bounce perturbation modes to the post-bounce ones, one needs asymptotic regions

where to define the “in” and “out” states, and hence a **large η behaviour** ... hence the assumption, **made in [1] in order to obtain an asymptotically bounded $W(\eta)$** (see, *e.g.*, equation (41) therein), of the polynomial scale factor ...” (emphasis ours). Ref. [1] of this sentence means Ref. [2] of the present note, whereas $W(\eta)$ is the effective potential for scalar perturbations, denoted $V_u(\eta)$ in Ref. [2]. Let us comment these statements.

The “in” and “out” regions in the model under consideration exist for $\eta \ll \eta_0$ provided η_0 is close to unity since in this case, the width of the potential itself is of order $\sqrt{\Upsilon} \equiv \sqrt{1 - \eta_0^{-2}} \ll 1$, see Eqs. (50) and (52) of Ref. [2]. Indeed, the effective potential rapidly goes to $V_u(\eta \ll \eta_0) \rightarrow 3$ while the modes of cosmological interest are such that $k^2 \gg 3$ (see discussion in Ref. [2]). Therefore, such “in” and “out” states can be defined even for $\eta \ll \eta_0$: they happen to be just plane waves. As a consequence, the treatment of Ref. [2] is valid whatever the actual complete solution for the scale factor, again provided $\Upsilon \ll 1$, and thus does not rest by any means on the assumption the work of Ref. [2] is credited by Ref. [1] (see also FIG. 5 of Ref. [2] which shows the explicit counterexample of an effective potential calculated in an exact non-polynomial case, $a(\eta) \propto \sqrt{1 + \eta^2/\eta_0^2}$, and compared to its approximation for which $\xi = -2/5$). The embedding of our short transition into a model that would be valid at all times was in fact discussed around FIG. 10 in Ref. [2]. Finally, let us note that the purpose of using the fitting formula of Eqs. (41) and (42) of Ref. [2] was in no way to obtain a bounded V_u (or W) but instead to get its actual value in the region where Eq. (1) is valid. The actual approximation scheme for the potential is in fact quite irrelevant (and in practice not used in Ref. [2]), what matters is the fact that the potential goes to a constant (less than k^2) value in a short enough timescale, *i.e.* $\eta \ll \eta_0$ so that an asymptotic region is available. The crucial point is that this property is valid not only for polynomial scale factors, but for a much wider class (provided Υ is small enough), as exemplified in FIG. 5

*Electronic address: jmartin@iap.fr

†Electronic address: peter@iap.fr

and discussed explicitly in the caption. Moreover, one can find other non polynomial examples that work in the same way [2], although it is probably possible to cook up special cases for which the abovementioned property does not hold.

Another point worth of a reply is the use of so-called “rescaled units”: if the spatial curvature $\mathcal{K}$ is normalized to unity {as done in Ref. [1], see the “1” on the left-hand-side of the Friedmann-Lemaître equation in the text above Eq. (2.1) of Ref. [1]}, a perfectly consistent choice which is made indeed very often, it is not possible to simply set the minimum value of the scale factor a_0 as well to unity, as done in Eq. (2.3) of Ref. [1]. In fact, when the spatial curvature is non-vanishing, as in the case at hand, the scale factor acquires a physical meaning and thus cannot be rescaled at will when $\mathcal{K} = 1$. Assuming it is unity and that therefore all dimensionfull quantities are implicitly expressed in units of a_0 is of course possible, but seems to us to be a source of confusion and errors since obviously, unless a value is assigned for a_0 , no physical conclusion can be drawn.

Let us illustrate our point by repeating the exercise consisting in calculating the scalar field potential close to the bounce (we cannot consider, given our framework, asymptotic expansions far from the bounce, *i.e.* $\eta \gg \eta_0$). Plugging a power series expansion into another, it is not surprising that the result for the potential $V(\varphi)$ is nothing but yet a power series in $\varphi - \varphi_0$, where φ_0 is the field value at the bounce. Since the bounce is assumed symmetric, an even function is necessarily obtained, *i.e.*

$$V(\varphi) = V_0 + \frac{1}{2}M_\varphi^2 (\varphi - \varphi_0)^2 + \frac{1}{4!}\lambda (\varphi - \varphi_0)^4 + \dots, \quad (2)$$

with parameters M_φ and λ to be determined by the coefficients appearing in the scale factor. Using Einstein and Klein-Gordon equations for the background (1), one immediately gets that the square mass is negative, meaning the field goes through a maximum of the potential as the bounce takes place, and, to leading order in Υ , that

$$a_0|M_\varphi| \sim \sqrt{\frac{-5\xi}{4\Upsilon}} \simeq 700, \quad (3)$$

where in the last equality for the numerical application,

we have chosen, as in Ref. [1], the values $\Upsilon = 10^{-6}$ and $\xi = -2/5$. Clearly, as long as the value of a_0 has not been provided, that is to say if one works with the units of Ref. [1], Eq. (3) is useless. Moreover, using the value $a_0 = 1$, there is now the danger to conclude erroneously that the mass parameter in the scalar field potential is larger than the Planck mass. As a matter of fact, using natural units, it is clear that provided the bounce occurs for a large enough scale factor, in practice $a_0 \gg 10^3 \ell_{\text{Pl}}$, the symmetry breaking mass parameter in the potential can be much smaller than the Planck scale. For instance, a natural choice could be the GUT scale ($a_0 \sim 10^5 \ell_{\text{Pl}}$), for which

$$M_\varphi \simeq 0.02 \times M_{\text{Pl}}, \quad (4)$$

with $M_{\text{Pl}} = \ell_{\text{Pl}}^{-1}$ the Planck mass. In connection with the discussion at the beginning of this note, let us notice that this result is particularly interesting in view of the fact that it is valid for a wide class of scale factors.

Finally, let us remark an additional mistake made in Ref. [1] in which it is said that “*the total energy of the scalar field ... at the bounce is $\varrho(0) = 3$... If one argues that what matters is the value of the total energy of the field with respect to the **Planck energy**, then the restriction on Υ falls*” (emphasis ours). In this particular case, and contrary to what appears in Ref. [7] of Ref. [1], the units are now explicitly Planckian. The correct statement should read $\varrho(0) = 3/a_0^2$ so that, again, if $a_0 \gg \ell_{\text{Pl}}$, then $\varrho(0)$ can be much less than the Planck energy density. We conclude that claiming the kinetic, potential or total energies of the field must be Planckian near the bounce is incorrect.

On a more general physical ground, it is clear that in a closed FLRW universe for which the scale factor normalization is meaningful, there is no hope to say anything relevant about the energies involved without having specified the minimal size of the universe at the bounce.

We wish to thank N. Deruelle, N. Pinto-Neto and J.-P. Uzan, and especially D. J. Schwarz for interesting remarks and careful reading of the manuscript.

-
- [1] N. Deruelle, *Bouncing Universes and their perturbations: remarks on a toy model*, [gr-qc/0404126](#), 30 April 2004.
 [2] J. Martin and P. Peter, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 103517 (2003);

Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 061301 (2004); Phys. Rev. D **69**, 107301 (2004).